



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

4
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,661	10/07/2003	Kevin R. Cormeille	10022/324	5785
33391	7590	05/02/2007	EXAMINER	
ACCENTURE INDY 33391			VO, NGUYEN THANH	
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ONE INDIANA SQUARE, SUITE 1600			2618	
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/680,661	CORNEILLE ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Nguyen Vo	2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 07 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As to independent claim 23, the claim is nothing but a computer program structure. In order to overcome this rejection, it is suggested that the recitation "A computer program embodied on a computer readable medium for provisioning mobile devices in a plurality of mobile devices, comprising" should be changed to --A computer readable medium encoded with a computer program for provisioning mobile devices in a plurality of mobile devices, comprising--.

As to claims 24-26, for the reason as set forth above, the recitation "The computer program of claim" at line 1 should be changed to --The computer readable medium of claim--.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to

which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As to claims 23-26, the original specification does not provide an enabling disclosure for a computer readable medium as claimed. The disclosure is totally silent about a computer readable medium as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-3, 6-7, 11-12, 15, 17, 20-21, 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhigang (US 2005/0014489 A1, cited by examiner) in view of Bryson (US 2004/0185777 A1, cited by examiner).

As to claim 1, Zhigang discloses connector gateway system 304 (see figure 3) that provides mobile devices 310 with access to business services, comprising: a mobile device 310 including an application that is capable of generating a service request (see paragraph [0049]); a wireless access network connected with the mobile device (see wireless network including numerals 104 and 105 in figure 1); a connector gateway server 124 (see figure 1) connected with the wireless access network; at least one business server connected with the connector gateway server (see servers 140, 142; see also paragraph [0042] which discloses that mobile terminal 302 operates as an HTTP server); where the service request generated from the application includes a DNS name that translates to an address on the connector gateway server (see paragraph [0049]); where the connector gateway server performs a lookup operation to determine the business server (see paragraphs [0049]-[0051]; [0081]); where the connector gateway authenticates that a user is a valid user of the requested service (see paragraph [0051]). Zhigang fails to disclose that the connector gateway server creates a data filter that drives an emulation between the mobile device and the business server to pump data between the mobile device and the business server. Bryson discloses a connector gateway server which creates a data filter that drives an emulation between the mobile device and the business server to pump data between the mobile device and the business server (see protocol emulator 130 in figure 1; see also paragraphs [0043], [0091]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Bryson to Zhigang, in order to

make the data compatible with a protocol associated with a network with which the transceiver communicates (as suggested by Bryson at paragraph [0010]).

As to claim 2, the combination of Zhigang and Bryson discloses the claimed limitations (see Bryson, paragraphs [0067]-[0068]).

As to claim 3, the combination of Zhigang and Bryson discloses the claimed limitations (see Zhigang, paragraphs [0036]-[0037], [0057]).

As to claims 6-7, 20-21, the combination of Zhigang and Bryson discloses the claimed limitations (see Bryson, paragraph [0060]).

As to claim 11, the combination of Zhigang and Bryson discloses the claimed limitations (see protocol emulator 130 in figure 1 of Bryson; see also paragraphs [0043], [0091]).

As to claim 12, the combination of Zhigang and Bryson discloses the claimed limitations (see Zhigang, paragraph [0051]).

As to claims 15, 23, they are rejected for similar reasons as set forth in claim 1 above.

As to claim 17, the combination of Zhigang and Bryson discloses the claimed limitations (see Zhigang, paragraphs [0049]-[0051]; [0081]).

As to claims 24-26, the combination of Zhigang and Bryson discloses the claimed limitations (see Zhigang, paragraphs [0049]-[0051]; [0081]).

8. Claims 4-5, 8-10, 13-14, 16, 18-19, 22, 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhigang in view of Bryson as applied to

claims 1, 15 above, and further in view of McConnell (US 2002/0015403 A1, cited by examiner).

As to claims 4, 16, 18, the combination of Zhigang and Bryson fails to disclose mapping a unique IP address and a port that corresponds to a service type as claimed. McConnell discloses mapping a unique IP address and a port that corresponds to a service type (see paragraphs [0065], [0086], [0094]-[0095], [0131]-[0133], [0156]-[0157]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of McConnell to the combination of Zhigang and Bryson, in order to allow a range of services to be provided in a versatile manner (as suggested by McConnell at paragraph [0007]).

As to claim 5, the combination of Zhigang and Bryson and McConnell further discloses the claimed limitations (see McConnell, paragraph [0094]).

As to claims 8-10, they are rejected for similar reasons as set forth in claim 5 above. In addition, see the sockets in figure 3 of McConnell.

As to claim 13, the combination of Zhigang and Bryson fails to disclose an LDAP lookup as claimed. McConnell discloses an LDAP lookup (see figure 2; paragraphs [0131]-[0132]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of McConnell to the combination of Zhigang and Bryson, in order to properly authenticate a requesting mobile device (as suggested by McConnell at paragraph [0131]).

As to claim 14, the combination of Zhigang and Bryson fails to disclose logging all user traffic in a text file as claimed. McConnell discloses logging all user traffic in a

text file (see paragraphs [0085], [0173], [0179], [0181]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of McConnell to the combination of Zhigang and Bryson, because it would be useful when performing traffic analysis or general troubleshooting (as suggested by McConnell at paragraph [0181]).

As to claim 19, it is rejected for similar reasons as set forth in claim 5 above.

As to claim 22, it is rejected for similar reasons as set forth in claim 8 above.

As to claim 27, it is rejected for similar reasons as set forth in claim 5 above.

As to claim 28, the combination of Zhigang and Bryson and McConnell discloses the claimed limitations (see Zhigang, paragraphs [0049]-[0051]; [0081]).

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Anderson (US 2003/0172183 A1); Juitt (US 2006/0234678 A1) disclose network gateways.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nguyen Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-7901. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban can be reached on (571) 272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nguyen Vo
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2618

Nguyen Vo
4_29_2007